

Ray C  
2600 San Leandro Blvd  
San Leandro CA 94578

Aug 12th 2018

Via ECFS  
Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
445 12th Street, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

**Re: In the Matter of Petition of USTelecom for Forbearance Pursuant to  
47 U.S.C. Section 160(c); WC Docket No. 18-141; Category 1**

Dear FCC,

I am a Scientist who has chosen a "smaller" internet service provider (Sonic) because due to a lack of regulation, competition has left the U.S. with some of the slowest, least reliable and most expensive broadband service in the developed world. However, there are some fighting to change this status quo. For too many years, the largest providers in the country have shown zero interest in deploying this change themselves. For too many years (going on 20 years now), I myself was a customer with either Comcast or AT&T (depending on where I lived, each respective time) simply because there were no other competitive options available. What I, as a consumer, was charged for modern, broadband speed internet was vastly out-of-line with a value product, but with their actual cost - much more than just a fair markup. I understand the major service providers are a business - but there is no sense in a monopolized environment where our only options are providers with no interest in providing consumers with the best product available. For too many years these major service providers have sworn that they are taking the extra revenues, and putting them towards finally modernizing their infrastructure, for the customers. We've now seen time and time again that they're not. Whenever modern infrastructure (Fiber Internet) is implemented, it is then charged at an astronomical premium - making you wonder then what all of the previous extra revenue was supposed to be for, then. It wasn't to actually provide a better, modernized product to the citizens of our great country. It was simply to put funds towards the next product - one that can have an even higher premium tacked onto it. Nowhere here does the consumer benefit. Our options effectively have become:

- 1) Contribute to revenue stream of a major service provider, so they can use it to explicitly profit as well as put it towards further infrastructure, at which point
- 2) We pay an astronomical premium for the modernized infrastructure, contributing to an even higher degree towards explicit profits.

If these profits were reinvested in the consumers, we wouldn't have the sentiment that exists today. The way it stands now however, there are only profits being made, and nothing being provided back to the consumers for our patronage. This is the tell-tale sign of a market with no competition. And in fact, there is a severe lack of competition. But it doesn't need to be this way. There are modern, on-the-edge smaller service providers who DO have the consumer in mind, while also being financially viable themselves. We need to put our citizens first, and reward the companies that do this harder job of providing a great product, while still constructing and maintaining a viable business model. This is a win-win situation for not only the consumer, but for the United States. In

a world that has become exponentially reliant on connectivity and the ability to exchange information quickly, this is something that I wholeheartedly stand behind. Please, support the (usually smaller) service providers who are being tasked with providing the technological and business end of fixing this system as-it-is, with your power as legislators. These service providers need to have a surface to stand on, before they can even wish to run.

Thank you for your time, it is most appreciated. As a Scientist I would say I'm a very rational thinker, and this is something I believe strongly in. Thus, I have taken the time to write out the above, because I believe that you can make a difference, too. We need to work together to support those who wish to make the most positive changes in our world.

Ray C